

of the lever (from the pivot end to the lock in the handle end) is secured to the device with the lock.

Claim 7

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 7 because its unique claimed geometry is neither taught or suggested by the cited prior art. The Examiner rejects Claim 7 as being obvious even though the Examiner states that "[n]either Katsouros nor Chang expressly state that the first and second members extend from the collar in a direction opposite to the first direction." Applicant respectfully submits that the unique geometry of the device claimed in Applicant's Claim 7 is not an obvious rearrangement of parts to someone skilled in the art because the configuration of Applicant's claimed invention provides a structural advantage wherein the lever can extend along the side of the collar while it is in the closed position. This makes it more difficult for a thief to open the locked lever and steal the bicycle seat because of the difficulty associated with inserting a pry bar under the lever as it extends along the collar from one side of the collar in a first direction, to the other side of the collar in the opposite direction.

Claim 13

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the time spent discussing Claim 13 on the telephone on July 26, 2004. In that telephone conversation, it was discussed that in Claim 1, the Examiner cited Katsouros' elements 100 and 200 for Applicant's "first member," and Katsouros' element 400 for Applicant's "second member." It was discussed that neither Katsouros' first member (elements 100 and 200), nor Katsouros'

Interview
Record
O.K.
Jmm
8/17/04